

Message

From: Costanzi, Frances [Costanzi.Frances@epa.gov]
Sent: 5/28/2020 4:55:09 PM
To: Aviles, Jesse [Aviles.Jesse@epa.gov]; Braun, Richard [Braun.Richard@epa.gov]; Wharton, Steve [Wharton.Steve@epa.gov]
CC: Guerra, Valeria [Guerra.Valeria@epa.gov]; Urdiales, Aaron [Urdiales.Aaron@epa.gov]; Poetter, Joe [poetter.joe@epa.gov]
Subject: Initial comments on draft SOW for VB/I-70 OU2 and OU3
Attachments: VB I70 2019-06-18 DES SOW.docx

Hi all. So I am attaching my comments on the draft DES SOW for VB/I-70 OU2 and OU3. I discussed the current thinking on the site strategy approach for these OUs with Steve Wharton late on 5/27 so I understood the current discussions and that there hadn't been significant changes from the last time I spoke with Jesse and Steve. I drafted my comments this morning quickly in light of the timeframes to get the document to contracts, but I would say this needs substantial re-write. Perhaps I have totally misunderstood something and am certainly open to the team explaining why I have misunderstood. I am available to discuss these comments and my calendar is current. I'm scheduled off on Friday, but am also willing to meet then.

I am copying Jesse and Rich, as well as Steve, as Steve requested. Because of the timing of the deadline for contracts and because this is the first SOW I have reviewed in my new position, I am also copying Jasmin, Aaron and Joe P. Managers – please advise if you have suggestions for me relative to my new detail.

I saved this draft SOW to my computer since I don't know if everyone has access to Jesse's personal OneDrive. I'd like to suggest that this is not the best way to set up these documents. I and others will have a very hard time working with these if we have to keep track of individual invites from each RPM to their special document locations. Steve indicated he may not have access to these documents on Jesse's OneDrive, so I downloaded the SOW to my laptop and am attaching that copy here.

I did not review any of the other documents Jesse provided since my comments on the SOW were so extensive.

My understanding from Steve is the RP (City and County of Denver) will be conducting the OU2 work under enforcement agreements and they are well aware of the time involved to put such agreements in place. Steve indicated the RP decided they would prefer a ROD and all that involves than conduct this work under a more speedy removal option. We cannot pre-select what work the RP will do, but need to develop the focused RI (using existing data) and FFS for the iROD. And then do a final RI/FS and ROD. There are multiple references to what work the RP has proposed as if a ROD has already been signed and I think this is ill-advised. I suggest referring to the likely or anticipated work as a relatively simple excavation and backfill so the contractor has an idea of the scope. I am unclear and can't tell from the SOW how extensive the final RI/FS will be. DO we anticipate it will essentially be an IC-only ROD or something much more involved? Sometimes there are references to treatability studies, but I can't tell if this should only apply to OU3 or you anticipate needing treatability studies for both OUs.

I can't tell if Jesse and the team will need support from the contractor developing the RD/RA Consent Decree SOW and/or support in the CD negotiations, or even their participation will be needed in those negotiations. The lengthy timeframe that a CD often takes does not appear to be reflected. I'm not clear if we already had an AOC in place. If so, it should be referred to, including timeframes. If not, does Jesse need support for these negotiations and SOW?

I also can't tell about the funding and if it is necessary for the contractor to carefully track their costs between the 2 OUs differently and separately. This is often very important if one is fund-lead and the other is special account or enforcement lead. Sometimes the work seems combined, such as the kick off meeting. I'm thinking the 2 OUs are quite different and I suggest drawing a bright line between the two OUs. You may have additional information that makes this unnecessary.

I also can't tell if you want options to take over all or part of the work in case the RP provides poor work products.

The submittal timeframes are very lengthy and confusing (see my comments in the document). I also some of the assumed hours for tasks seem unsubstantiated. Again, please see my comments.

There are also sections that are just there, without hours assumed. Should we deleted these, as was done with the FYR? OR did you not know how to assign hours.

Again, please excuse this quick review, but I wanted to get something to you as quickly as I could now that I have started the detail.

Fran

Frances L. Costanzi, P. E.
Remedial Project Manager Advisor and
Superfund Redevelopment Coordinator
USEPA Region 8
1595 Wynkoop Street
Mail code 8SEM-RB
Denver, CO 80202
email: costanzi.frances@epa.gov
phone: 303-312-6571

Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)